



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,819	09/17/2003	Andrzej Strak	TRSE121566	3439
26389 7590 06/02/2008 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER PADEN, CAROLYN A	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/02/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>10/664,819</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>STRAK ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Carolyn A. Paden</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>1794</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-11,15,19-21,23 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-11,15,19-21 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-11, 15, 19-21, 23 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly (3,897,573) taken with Akesson (4,886,676) in view of Mahon (3,036,923).

Kelly discloses salting fillets of fish and then coating the salted fillets with a binder made of comminuted fish muscle mixed with salt and phosphate and forming a molded, coated fish fillet (see abstract). In example 1 the coated fish is frozen and then smoked at 86F for about 6 hours and then re-frozen. The claims appear to differ from the examples in Kelly in the recitation that the starting material is frozen fish. Kelly teaches that it is known in the art to form uniform fish pieces by molding fish fillets into frozen blocks and then subsequently cutting the blocks into smaller pieces while the fish is frozen. Kelly also discloses that coating the frozen fish acts to hold the individual pieces together. Akesson is further relied

upon to show cutting frozen fish into frozen pieces and using the fish sawdust to coat the surfaces of the frozen fish to hold the fish together (see abstract). Thus Kelly alone or in combination with Akesson teaches treating frozen fish with a binder of fish paste. The claims appear to differ from Kelly in the recitation of the use of phosphate in step a). Mahon teaches the advantages of using sodium and potassium polyphosphates to improve the taste and shelf life of haddock. Table 1 shows the various test solutions. In Table V the salt and phosphate dips are combined. The treatment time is shown at column 3, lines 6-8 to be at 2 minutes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the dip of Mahon in place of the salt of Kelly to improve the taste and yield of the Kelly fish products. It is appreciated that the extent of phosphate and salt in the final product are not mentioned but no unobvious or unexpected difference is seen between the salt and phosphate in the fish product of Kelly in view of Mahon and the extent salt and phosphate in the fish of the process of the claims. To the extent that the binder in Kelly and Akesson is based upon fish meat, it is considered to be a surimi-based binder. It is appreciated that the orientation of the seafood portions are not mentioned but no unobvious or unexpected result is seen from this feature. It is also

appreciated that the size and shape of the seafood pieces are not mentioned but to prepare portions of seafood at a consumable size would have been an obvious way to prepare the seafood. It is finally appreciated that the heat treatment time of claim 19 is not mentioned but no unobvious or unexpected result is seen from the extent of treatment in Kelly and that of the claims. It is well known in the art that cooking times may be reduced when cooking temperatures are increased. Kelly provides from varying conditions of smoking the fish at column 1, lines 55-60. To modify the cooking temperatures of Kelly to reduce cooking time would have been well within the determination of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant argues that Kelly uses too much salt and one would not be able to predict the result of the Kelly fish without salt. This has been considered but is not persuasive. Kelly provides for a fish with 1-10 % salt (column 1, line 65), which is in the range of that set forth by the claims.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly as further evidenced by Akesson (4,886,676) in view of Mahon as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 9-11, 15, 19-21, 23 and 27-31 above, and further in view of Chang (4,411,917).

The claim appears to differ from Kelly as further evidenced by Akesson in view of Mahon in the recitation of the use of tetra sodium pyrophosphate in fish. Chang teaches that tetra sodium pyrophosphate is well known in the art as a phosphate source for use in fish. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the phosphate of Chang in the fish of Kelly in view of Mahon as an obvious phosphate source.

Applicants arguments are directed to the independent claims and so no arguments need to be addressed herein.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached by dialing 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on

Application/Control Number: 10/664,819
Art Unit: 1794

Page 7

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Carolyn Paden/

Primary Examiner 1794